



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,473

12/31/2003

Kavin Du

121532

3931

26389

7590

06/22/2009

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2444

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/22/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/749,473	Applicant(s) DU ET AL.	
	Examiner RANODHI N. SERRAO	Art Unit 2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-30 and 32-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10, 30 and 32-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 30 and 32-39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/12/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 May 2009 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
- I. Claims 1-10 and 36-38, drawn to electronic shopping (e.g. remote ordering), classified in class 705, subclass 26.
 - II. Claims 12-29, drawn to market analysis, demand forecasting or surveying, classified in class 705, subclass 10.
 - III. Claims 30, 32-35, and 39, drawn to client/server, classified in class 709, subclass 203.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
- Inventions group I, group II, and group III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as

claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it distinctly relates to electronic shopping (e.g. remote ordering). The second subcombination has separate utility such as market analysis, demand forecasting or surveying. The third subcombination has separate utility such as client/server.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. During a telephone conversation with Kevan L. Morgan (Reg. No. 42,015) on 16 June 2009 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group II, claims 12-29. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-10, 30, and 32-39 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 12-29 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argued:

Claim 12 was rejected under the same basic rationale as Claim 1. Claim 12 has been amended to further recite "a subsystem with a storage database configured to store at least one of the instances of identifying data or the item information as profile information associated with the user." The profile information "is used to anticipate the user's purchasing interests and provide one or more targeted offers to the user." For at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that Bernard and Kinjo fail to teach all of the combination of elements recited in Claim 12. Accordingly, Claim 12 is in patentable condition. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12 is requested.

9. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In col. 10, lines 48-60 and in col. 51, lines 29-41 Bernard states:

"In one embodiment, if the purchaser is not a member, the purchaser is still permitted to browse the available product listings, listen to or view product descriptions and sample product offerings. The non-member purchaser can even purchase products. However, because a non-member does not have a membership profile, the non-member will speak to a sales representative to complete the sale. At this time, the sales representative obtains payment and delivery information from the purchaser to complete the sale. If the purchaser desires, this information can be entered into a **membership profile for that purchaser**, allowing the purchaser to purchase products **in the future** without having to speak to a sales representative." (Emphasis added).

"In one embodiment promotional items are offered to a customer 182 based on his or her calling and **purchasing history**. For example, in one embodiment, the automated product purchasing system review calling and **purchasing statistics** maintained for a shopper 182. Statistics can be maintained by VRU 104, interactive transaction database 112, or even by reporting database 438. If these statistics indicate that the shopper is a particularly good customer of the automated product purchasing system, interface unit 104 may offer a promotional or special item to that shopper 182. For example, where shopper 182 is a frequent purchaser, interface unit 104 may inform him or her that upon the **next purchase**, he or she will receive a bonus CD." (Emphasis added).

Art Unit: 2444

10. As shown from the cited sections above, Bernard clearly anticipates the added limitations of claim 12. Bernard teaches: *a subsystem with a storage database (col. 5, line 2: database) configured to store at least one of the instances of identifying data or the item information as profile information associated with the user, wherein the profile information is used to anticipate the user's purchasing interests and provide one or more targeted offers to the user* (If the purchaser desires, this information can be entered into a **membership profile for that purchaser**, allowing the purchaser to purchase products **in the future** without having to speak to a sales representative.).

11. Applicant also stated:

Amended Claim 22 recites elements similar to those of amended Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, applicants submit that Bernard and Kinjo, whether considered alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 22. In particular, Bernard and Kinjo fail to teach the recited "computer-executable component [that] is executed by a server of the second retail entity" that "stor[es] at least one of the instances of identifying data or the item information as profile information in a database associated with the user, wherein the profile information is used to anticipate the user's purchasing interests and provide one or more targeted offers to the user." For at least these reasons, the rejection of Claim 22 should be withdrawn.

12. The same reasons provided above in regards to claim 12 apply fully to claim 22.

Thus the cited references teach the claimed invention.

13. Applicant further remarked:

For example, Claim 29 recites "wherein extracting identifying data associated with the selected item from the image includes processing the universal product code with a UPC recognition program to produce a first output and processing the text with an optical character recognition program to produce a second output." The Office Action alleged that this feature is taught by Siegel at paragraph [0067] but this passage of Siegel has nothing to do with the recitation of Claim 29. According to Siegel, a monthly billing statement may have a UPC representing the amount due, but there is no discussion of "processing the text with an optical character recognition program to produce a second output."

14. Paragraph [0067] of Siegel states:

[0067] "The present invention can also be used to scan their monthly billing statements, which often have the "amount due" in a UPC on the statements (e.g., most credit card companies, cable companies and other companies that do automated payments). Such statements, as well as other financial papers such as **the customer's checks**, also have information that can be optically scanned from the MICR codes found on the same. **This information can then be used by the customer in connection with his or her personal finances. For example, the information can be downloaded to the customer's Quicken accounts for automatic payments from their accounts.**" (Emphasis added).

15. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that since the customer's check information is downloaded (outputted) to the customer's Quicken accounts, an optical character recognition program must be used to process and transfer the text from the check to the Quicken account. Therefore Siegel teaches the claimed limitations.

16. The examiner points out that the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" [In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969)] and "consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach" [In re Cortright, 49 USPQ2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1999)]. In conclusion, upon taking the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the cited references teach all of the claimed limitations. And the rejections are maintained. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

17. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

18. Claims 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

19. The claims recite “a system” however the system does not consist of nor is tied to any hardware therefore the claimed invention does not fall within at least one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. The claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of “real world” value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96 (1966)); In re Fisher, 421 F.3d 1365, 76 USPQ2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005); In re Ziegler, 992 F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

20. The Examiner suggests amending the claims to include a processor and a memory unit in order to resolve the 35 U.S.C. 101 issues.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

22. Claims 12, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard et al. (5,918,213) in view of Kinjo (2003/0063575).

23. As per claim 12, Bernard et al. teaches a system for communicating information regarding a selected item to a user present at a location of a first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 34-42), wherein the system comprises a server operated by a second retail entity that is different than the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 20, lines 48-64) and the selected item is available for purchase at the second retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33), the server comprising: a subsystem configured to receive a bar-code directly from a scanning device of the user, wherein the bar-code contains identifying data associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 53, line 65-col. 54, line 6 and col. 54, lines 28-50); a subsystem configured to use the identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50), wherein the item information is obtained from at least one resource (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 53-64); a subsystem configured to communicate the item information directly to the scanning device of the user while the user remains present at the location of the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50); and a subsystem with a storage database configured to store at least one of the instances of identifying data or the item information as profile information associated with the user, wherein the profile information is used to anticipate the user's

purchasing interests and provide one or more targeted offers to the user (see Bernard et al., col. 10, lines 48-60 and col. 51, lines 29-41).

But fails to explicitly teach a server being in communication with an imaging device of the user that is configured to capture an image of identifying data associated with the selected item; wherein the image contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item; a subsystem configured to extract the identifying data from each of the multiple instances in the image using a data recognition procedure that operates on an instance of the identifying data and produces an output; a subsystem configured to compare the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; a subsystem configured to use the corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item.

However, Kinjo teaches a server being in communication with an imaging device of the user that is configured to capture an image of identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, paragraph 132-134); wherein the image contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, paragraph 124); a subsystem configured to extract the identifying data from each of the multiple instances in the image using a data recognition procedure that operates on an instance of the identifying data and produces an output (see Kinjo, paragraph 34-37); a subsystem configured to compare the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data (see Kinjo, paragraph 135); a subsystem configured to use the

corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, paragraph 141-143).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. to a server being in communication with an imaging device of the user that is configured to capture an image of identifying data associated with the selected item; wherein the image contains multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item; a subsystem configured to extract the identifying data from each of the multiple instances in the image using a data recognition procedure that operates on an instance of the identifying data and produces an output; a subsystem configured to compare the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; a subsystem configured to use the corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item in order to provide an order processing apparatus and an image photographing device with which a customer can easily place an order corresponding to images displayed on a display medium (see Kinjo, paragraph 8).

24. As per claim 21, Bernard et al. in view of Kinjo teach the system of Claim 12, wherein the server operated by the second retail entity is at a location remote from the location of the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 55, lines 9-21).

25. As per claim 22, Bernard et al. teaches a computer-readable storage medium having a computer-executable component for communicating item information for a selected item to a user present at a location of a first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 34-42), wherein the selected item is available for purchase at a second retail entity that is different than the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 53, lines 27-33), and wherein the computer-executable component is executed by a server of the second retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 20, lines 48-64) and communicates the item information by: receiving a bar-code directly from a scanning device of the user, said bar-code containing identifying data associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 53, line 65-col. 54, line 6 and col. 54, lines 28-50); using the identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50); communicating the item information directly from the server to the scanning device of the user while the user remains present at the location of the first retail entity (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50); and storing at least one of the instances of identifying data or the item information as profile information in a database associated with the user, wherein the profile information is used to anticipate the user's purchasing interests and provide one or more targeted offers to the user (see Bernard et al., col. 10, lines 48-60 and col. 51, lines 29-41).

But fails to explicitly teach receiving an image from an imaging device of the user; said image containing multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item; for each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure that produces an

output; comparing the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; using the corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item.

However, Kinjo teaches receiving an image from an imaging device of the user (see Kinjo, paragraph 132-134); said image containing multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, paragraph 124); for each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure that produces an output (see Kinjo, paragraph 34-37); comparing the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data (see Kinjo, paragraph 135); using the corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item (see Kinjo, paragraph 141-143).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. to receiving an image from an imaging device of the user; said image containing multiple instances of identifying data associated with the selected item; for each of the multiple instances of identifying data, extracting the identifying data from the image using a data recognition procedure that produces an output; comparing the output of each of the data recognition procedures to corroborate the identification of the selected item that is obtained from each instance of the identifying data; using the corroborated identifying data to obtain item information associated with the selected item in order to provide an order processing apparatus and

an image photographing device with which a customer can easily place an order corresponding to images displayed on a display medium (see Kinjo, paragraph 8).

26. Claims 13, 14, 16-20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard et al. and Kinjo as applied to claims 12 and 22 above, and further in view of Siegel et al. (2002/0082931).

27. As per claim 13, Bernard et al. and Kinjo teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach a system, wherein the resource is a Web service providing information related to the selected item. However, Siegel et al. teaches a system, wherein the resource is a Web service providing information related to the selected item (see Siegel et al., paragraph 48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. and Kinjo to a system, wherein the resource is a Web service providing information related to the selected item in order to enable users to obtain information regarding a retailable or consumer product on the basis of encoded information, for example, on the product itself or its associated packaging or advertisements (see Siegel et al., paragraph 1).

28. As per claims 14, 16-20 and 29, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 13 applies fully in order to combine Bernard et al., Kinjo and Siegel et al.

29. As per claim 14, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a system, wherein the resource is a database storing information related to the selected item (see Siegel et al., paragraph 48).

Art Unit: 2444

30. As per claim 16, Bernard et al., Kinjo, and Siegel et al. teach the system of Claim 12, wherein the server subsystem that communicates the item information is further configured to communicate the item information in a format that enables generation of a visual output on a display (see Siegel et al., paragraph 70).

31. As per claim 17, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach the system of claim 12, wherein the server further comprises a subsystem configured to compile historical data based on a frequency of receipt of images from different imaging devices, said images containing identifying data associated with the selected item, and generate a report that forecasts future purchasing activity for the item based on the estimated consumer demand (see Siegel et al., paragraph 64).

32. As per claim 18, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach the system of claim 12, wherein the item information comprises rating information for the selected item associated with the identifying data (see Siegel et al., paragraph 57).

33. As per claim 19, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach the system of Claim 12, wherein the item information comprises price information for the selected item associated with the identifying data (see Siegel et al., paragraph 57).

34. As per claim 20, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach the system of Claim 12, wherein at least one instance of the identifying data comprises a universal product code and another instance of the identifying data comprises text (see Siegel et al., paragraph 45-46).

35. As per claim 29, Bernard et al., Siegel et al., and Kinjo teach a computer-readable storage medium, wherein extracting identifying data associated with the

selected item from the universal product code with a UPC recognition program to produce a first output and processing the text with an optical character recognition program to produce a second output (see Siegel et al., paragraph 67).

36. **Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard et al. and Kinjo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fitzsimmons, JR. (2002/0068991).** Bernard et al. and Kinjo teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above and Kinjo furthermore teaches an imaging device (see Kinjo, paragraph 132-134) and Bernard et al. furthermore teaches item information communicated from the second retail entity to a scanning device (see Bernard et al., col. 54, lines 28-50). But fail to teach the system further configured to enable generation of an audible signal through a speaker. However, Fitzsimmons, JR. teaches the system further configured to enable generation of an audible signal through a speaker (see Fitzsimmons, JR., paragraph 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bernard et al. and Kinjo to the system further configured to enable generation of an audible signal through a speaker in order to improve methods and apparatus for enriching the experience of a visitor to a display facility or other public space (see Fitzsimmons, JR. paragraph 5).

37. Claims 23-28 have similar limitations as to claims 12-14, 22, and 29 above; therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/RANODHI N SERRAO/

Examiner, Art Unit 2444